



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/538,871

08/18/2005

Thomas Leucht

GAS-009

8789

32628

7590

06/29/2007

KANESAKA BERNER AND PARTNERS LLP

1700 DIAGONAL RD

SUITE 310

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2848

EXAMINER

DAVIS, JENNA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/29/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/538,871	Applicant(s) LEUCHT ET AL.	
	Examiner Jenna Davis	Art Unit 1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozaki (US 6248820) in view of Marx (US 4774268).

Nozaki et al. teach a flame retardant for flameproof mesh sheets which does not generate harmful halogen gas. The flame retardant for mesh sheets comprises red phosphorus, an ammonium polyphosphate compound in an amount of 10 to 70 parts byweight based on 100 parts by weight of an aqueous dispersion, and a resin solid content (abstract). Ammonium polyphosphate acts as the flame retardant and would necessarily be an acid donor. The flame retardant can be used to impregnated, flameproof mesh sheets woven out of coated yarn (co 1.3 liens 6-8). The polymer can be a polyurethane having the main structure of a polyester (col.4 line 23). The red phosphorus promotes the carbonization of polyurethane (co 1.5 lines 60-62), which necessarily acts as a carbon donor. The polyurethane aqueous dispersion is present in amounts of about 10 to 70 wt.% (col .4 lines 45-46). Inherent to polyurethane is a crystallization temperature of less than 190°C and a melting temperature in the range of 50°C to 400°C or a decomposition temperature in the range of 150°C to 500°C. Therefore, the polyurethane would necessarily have a difference between the melting temperature and the crystallization temperature in the range of 55 to 70 K. While the reference does not require the coating to be transparent, it would have been

Art Unit: 1771

obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to do so in order to be able to view the underlying substrate. Although Nozaki et al. do not explicitly teach the claimed carbon content, it is reasonable to presume that the polymer material inherently provides a share of at least 20 weight percent of the carbon. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e. flame retardants for mesh sheets), which would result in the claimed property. The burden is upon the Applicant to prove otherwise. In addition, the presently claimed property would obviously have been present once the claimed product is provided. Nozaki et al. teach the use of mold preventing agents (col.7 lines 62-63), but do not specifically teach an insecticide or bactericide. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a mold preventing agent since Examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of insecticides or bactericides and mold preventing agents for their use in the art and the selection of these known equivalents to be used as fungicides would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. Further, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the desired weight percents of the fungicides through the process of routine experimentation in order to arrive at values which offered the optimum fungus or bacteria prevention in the invention of Nozaki et al.

Nozaki et al. fail to teach that the coating comprises from 0.5 to 10-weight % of an isocyanate or a melamine-formaldehyde. Marx et al. are drawn to flame resistant polyurethane compositions. Marx et al. teach that the flame retardant composition comprises from 10 to 50 weight percent of a melamine formaldehyde (co 1.7 lines 45-48). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the melamine

Art Unit: 1771

formaldehyde of Marx et al. into the coating composition of Nozaki et al. motivated to act as a crosslinking agent as well as to allow the polyurethane to soften when heated.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Marx as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Maples (US 6284343) substantially as set forth on page five of the final rejection dated 11/2/2007.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to provide the Nozaki material in transparent form in order to be able to view the underlying substrate.

The argument that the presently claimed invention is distinguished from Nozaki because the ammonium polyphosphate is dissolved directly in the aqueous dispersion is unpersuasive as it is not commensurate in scope with the present claims.


In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenna Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-3357. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 1771

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Jenna Davis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1771

jld